



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,751	10/01/2001	Emmanuelle Belli	13833.0008	3618

7590 08/04/2003  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

HUI, SAN MING R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,751

Applicant(s)

BELLI, EMMANUELLE

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-35,37-39 and 41-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-35,37-39 and 41-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendments filed May 12, 2003 have been entered. The cancellation of claims 36 and 40 in amendments filed May 12, 2003 is acknowledged. The addition of claims 41-48 in amendments filed May 12, 2003 is acknowledged.

Claims 26-35, 37-39, and 41-48 are pending.

The outstanding objection under 37 CFR 1.75 is withdrawn in view of the cancellation of claim 40.

Please note that the term "derivatives" recited in claim 35, line 3 renders the scope of the claim indefinite.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 26-35, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015).

Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) teaches a cosmetic composition comprising polymers of monomers such acrylic acid, methacrylic acid, acrilamide (see col. 6, line 63 to col. 7, line 47). Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) also teaches a hair styling gel comprising 2.5 weight percent of Graft copolymer 1.2 (which comprises methacrylic acid and tert-butyl acrylate), 0.5 weight percent Carbomar 940 (a thickening agent), see particularly col. 17 lines 23-26 and col. 19, example 17. Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) further teaches the addition of optional ingredients such as xanthan gum (a polymeric thickener) to its cosmetic hair composition, see col.16, lines 14-26. Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) teaches that the concentration of optional ingredients will typically and collectively range from 0.05% to 30% by weight of the composition, see particularly col. 14, lines 36-46. Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) that the cosmetic composition is suitable for application to hair, see col. 11 line 59 in particular.

Midha et al. does not expressly teach the composition have the herein viscosity. Midha et al. does not expressly teach the employment of the herein claimed branched block copolymer and the herein claimed thickeners in a cosmetic hair gel composition.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ specifically the claimed branched block copolymer and the thickeners claimed herein in a cosmetic hair gel composition and adjust the viscosity to the herein claimed range.

Art Unit: 1617

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the herein claimed branched block copolymer and the thickeners in a cosmetic hair gel composition. The herein claimed polymer and the herein claimed thickeners are taught by examiner's cited prior art to be used in cosmetic hair gel compositions. Incorporating these well-known hair gel components for formulating the herein claimed cosmetic hair gel composition would be obvious as considered within the purview of skilled artisan, absent evidence to the contrary. Furthermore, the optimization of result effect parameters (e.g., viscosity of the composition) is obvious as being within the skill of the artisan. Please note that the viscosity of the composition depends upon many factors such as the molecular weight of the polymers and the concentration of the polymer. Adjusting the concentration, thereby the viscosity, of the composition is within the purview of skilled artisan, absent evidence to the contrary.

Examiner notes that the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic of the claimed invention. For the purpose of searching for and applying prior art under 35 USC 102 and 103, absent clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising" See, e.g., PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355. ("PPG could have defined the scope of the phrase consisting essentially of for purposes of its patent by making clear in its specification what it regarded as constituting a material change in the basic and novel characteristics of the invention."). When an applicant contends that additional steps or

Art Unit: 1617

materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of,"  
applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or  
components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's invention. *In re*  
*De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also *Ex parte Hoffman*,  
12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989) ("Although consisting  
essentially of is typically used and defined in the context of compositions of matter, we  
find nothing intrinsically wrong with the use of such language as a modifier of method  
steps. . . [rendering] the claim open only for the inclusion of steps which do not  
materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed method. To  
determine the steps included versus excluded the claim must be read in light of the  
specification. . . . [I]t is an applicant's burden to establish that a step practiced in a prior  
art method is excluded from his claims by 'consisting essentially of' language.") (See  
MPEP 2111.03).

Claims 41-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) in view of Merck (Merck Index, 11<sup>th</sup> ed., 1989,  
monograph 4486).

Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) teaches a cosmetic composition comprising  
polymers of monomers such as acrylic acid, methacrylic acid, acrilamide (see col. 6, line  
63 to col. 7, line 47). Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) also teaches a hair styling gel  
comprising 2.5 weight percent of Graft copolymer 1.2 (which comprises methacrylic acid  
and tert-butyl acrylate), 0.5 weight percent Carbomar 940 (a thickening agent), see

Art Unit: 1617

particularly col. 17 lines 23-26 and col. 19, example 17. Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) further teaches the addition of optional thickening agents such as xanthan gum (a polymeric thickener) to its cosmetic hair composition, see col.16, lines 14-26. Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) teaches that the concentration of optional ingredients will typically and collectively range from 0.05% to 30% by weight of the composition, see particularly col. 14, lines 36-46. Midha et al. (USPN 5,986,015) that the cosmetic composition is suitable for application to hair, see col. 11 line 59 in particular.

Midha et al. does not expressly teach the composition have the herein viscosity. Midha et al. does not expressly teach the employment of the herein claimed branched block copolymer and the herein claimed thickeners as guar gum in a cosmetic hair gel composition.

Merck Index teaches the guar gum is a well-known thickening agent useful in cosmetic, pharmaceutical and food industry, especially for pharmaceutical jelly composition (See the USE Section).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ specifically the claimed branched block copolymer and guar gum in a cosmetic hair gel composition and adjust the viscosity to the herein claimed range.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the herein claimed branched block copolymer and guar gum in a cosmetic hair gel composition. The herein claimed polymer is taught by examiner's cited prior art to be used in cosmetic hair gel compositions. Incorporating these well-known hair gel components for

Art Unit: 1617

formulating the herein claimed cosmetic hair gel composition would be obvious as considered within the purview of skilled artisan, absent evidence to the contrary. In addition, guar gum is also known to be useful as a thickening agent for jelly composition. Incorporating well-known thickening agents, such as guar gum, in the composition of Midha et al. would be considered obvious as being selecting from the obvious alternatives. Furthermore, the optimization of result effect parameters (e.g., viscosity of the composition) is obvious as being within the skill of the artisan. Please note that the viscosity of the composition depends upon many factors such as the molecular weight of the polymers and the concentration of the polymer. Adjusting the concentration, thereby the viscosity, of the composition is within the purview of skilled artisan, absent evidence to the contrary.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2003 averring Midha et al. not teaching the herein claimed graft polymers have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As discussed in the previous action, Midha et al. clearly teaches the herein claimed monomers such as acrylic acid, methacrylic acid, acrilamide (see col. 6, line 63 to col. 7, line 47). Midha et al. also teaches the method of making graft polymers can be hydrophilic or hydrophobic backbone grafted with either hydrophilic or hydrophobic side chain (See col. 5, lines 15-25). Absent evidence to the contrary, one of ordinary in the art would have employ the monomers of Midha et al. to form the specific graft polymers herein and employing them into cosmetic hair composition as taught in Midha et al.



Art Unit: 1617

since selecting the herein claimed hydrophilic/hydrophobic graft polymers would be simply considered as choosing from the obvious alternatives by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2003 averring the examples of Midha et al. not teaching the herein claimed graft polymers have been fully considered, but are not found persuasive. As discussed above, Midha et al. clearly teaches the herein claimed monomers and also teaches these monomers can be used to synthesize different types of graft polymers as suitable. Therefore, arguments that are drawn to Midha et al. not teaching the herein claimed graft polymers merely based on the examples disclosed in Midha et al. not teaching such graft polymers are not convincing. The rejection is based on the teachings of Midha et al. as a whole, rather than just the examples taught in the prior art.

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2003 averring the use of at least two thickening agents not being taught by the cited prior art have been considered, but are not found persuasive. Midha et al. teaches the two thickening agents can be incorporated into the composition, although they are intended to be used as thickening agents. Examiner notes that the intended use of the components does not lend patentable weight. Midha et al. teaches the same components herein.

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2003 with regard to the examples set forth in the instant specification have been considered, but are not found persuasive. The broadest claims herein do not recite any amount of the components. Therefore, the

examples on the viscosity of the resulting composition do not seem to be relevant to the herein recited composition.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

Art Unit: 1617

are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

San-ming Hui  
July 16, 2003

  
THEODORE J. CRIARES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200/100